

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 1 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically the Office Action asserts the specification does not adequately disclose how the claimed maximum free-wheeling gear and the claimed maximum free-wheeling speed are determined or predetermined.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18 and 22, do not recite “the maximum free-wheeling speed” or “the maximum free-wheeling gear.” In addition to the previous arguments, it is respectfully submitted that it is not necessary to understand the determination of the maximum free-wheeling speed or maximum free-wheeling gear to satisfy the enablement requirements for these claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 3, 7, 12, 17, 19, 20 and 21, the determination and predetermination of the maximum free-wheeling gear and the maximum free-wheeling speed are well understood to one skill in the art of building transmissions, as already discussed in the previous office actions. In any event, the determination of the maximum free-wheeling gear and the maximum free-wheeling speed are not necessary to enable these claims either. Specifically, these claims do not recite determination of the maximum free-wheeling gear or the maximum free-wheeling speed, but rather have these elements as givens. These claims are clearly enabled to one of skill in the art, as the maximum free-wheeling gear and the maximum free-wheeling speed can be simply selected to be any desired value and still enable the claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 3, 7, 12, 17, 19, 20 and 21, under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By 
William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
Tel: (212) 736-1940
Fax: (212) 736-2427